



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/041,881	10/24/2001	Gary Rasmussen	577172003200	4280
43997	7590	01/16/2007	EXAMINER	
OPTV/MOFO			SALTARELLI, DOMINIC D	
C/O MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD, SUITE 300				2623
MCLEAN, VA 22102				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/16/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/041,881	RASMUSSEN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Dominic D. Saltarelli	2623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

- The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
  - The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
  - The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

- The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

- The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
  - They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
- Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
- Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
- For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-25.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

- The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
- The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

- The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**JOHN MILLER**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: First, regarding claim 1, applicant argues that Wistendahl does not teach storing the hot spot and its attributes in a "generic format", referring back to Wistendahl who uses the term "standard format" instead (applicant's remarks, page 7). However, the interpretation of "standard format" as used by Wistendahl is dependent upon the context in which it is used. Column 5, lines 4-7 read "The coordinate/address data of the "hot spots" are preferably in a standard format that can be accessed by any interactive digital media (IDM) program written to run with that media presentation." Because Wistendahl defines a "standard format" as one that is non-specific to any one particular IDM program, it meets the common English language definition of "generic", which is: "of, applicable to, or referring to all the members of a genus, class, group, or kind; general".

Second, regarding claims 8 and 13, applicant argues that Wistendahl does not teach the two separate claimed steps receiving a geometric outline defined for a hot spot and assigning attributes for that geometrically defined hot spot based on the template (applicant's remarks, page 8). However, column 9 line 62 through column 10 line 57 of Wistendahl describe the manner in which object mapping takes place. In each of the examples given (where an author draws the geometric outline for each frame, identifying an unmoving object over successive frames, and tracking a moving object over successive frames), the object is outlined first, prior to defining a hyperlink between the outlined object and a function. Simply put, the method performed by Wistendahl must first find the object (outline it) before it can hyperlink it (assign an attribute based on an authored template).

Third, regarding claim 10, applicant argues that the combination of Wistendahl and Lonnroth does not teach the claimed limitations found in claim 10. However, in the previous action (mailed on September 21, 2006), the examiner admitted as much and relied upon official notice to rectify said deficiency.

Lastly, regarding claims 11 and 12, applicant simply claims the combination of Wistendahl and Lonnroth do not teach the claimed limitations of claims 11 and 12 without supporting reasoning as to any possible deficiencies of the combination. As such the examiner must simply refer back to the reasoning set forth in the previous office action as to how the combination of Wistendahl and Lonnroth render claims 11 and 12 obvious..